

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

FREDERICK WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT  
OF CORRECTIONS,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:25-cv-00065-RAJ-GJL

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO AMEND

The District Court has referred this civil rights action to United States Magistrate Judge Grady J. Leupold. Plaintiff Frederick Williams, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed a Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on February 28, 2025. Dkt. 7. On March 5, 2025, this Court entered an Order declining to serve Plaintiff's Complaint (Dkt. 7) because it lacked specificity and was factually deficient. Dkt. 9. The Court granted Plaintiff leave to amend the Complaint within 30 days to correct the deficiencies. Dkt. 9 at 6.

To date, Plaintiff has not filed an Amended Complaint, and his time for doing so has passed. Rather, on March 27, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Amend the Complaint which appears to contain several new factual allegations. Dkt. 10. Importantly, however, Plaintiff did

1 not attach a proposed Amended Complaint to the Motion. *Id.*; *see also* Local Rule 15(a) (“A  
2 party who moves for leave to amend a pleading must attach a copy of the proposed amended  
3 pleading as an exhibit to the motion.”).

4 To be clear: Plaintiff did not need to file a Motion to Amend the Complaint because the  
5 Court already granted Plaintiff leave to amend. *See* Dkt. 9. Plaintiff was required only to file his  
6 Amended Complaint by the deadline, which he did not do.

7 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend the Complaint (Dkt. 10) is **DENIED** as  
8 **MOOT** because the Court has already granted Plaintiff leave to amend the Complaint. Cognizant  
9 of Plaintiff’s *pro se* status and his stated difficulties representing himself due to dyslexia, *see*  
10 Dkt. 8, the Court will grant Plaintiff additional time to amend his Complaint—Plaintiff **SHALL**  
11 **FILE an Amended Complaint** on the form provided by the Court by **April 30, 2025**. The Court  
12 warns that if Plaintiff fails to file an Amended Complaint correcting the deficiencies previously  
13 identified by the Court (*see* Dkt. 9) by **April 30, 2025**, the Court may recommend this matter be  
14 **dismissed without prejudice**.

15 The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order and the Court’s prisoner civil rights  
16 complaint form to Plaintiff.

17 Dated this 8th day of April, 2025.

18  
19 

20 Grady J. Leupold  
21 United States Magistrate Judge  
22  
23  
24